



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

Eoh

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|

1/25/00

06/16/00

ALEXANDROV

N

2750-5127

002292

HM12/0824

DELOITTE STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH

PO BOX 747

FALLS CHURCH VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

SHEINBERG, N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1631

DATE MAILED:

08/24/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/595,326

Applicant(s)

ALEXANDROV ET AL.

Examiner

Monika B. Sheinberg

Art Unit

1631

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 25-50 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Election

Applicants' election of Group I (claims 1-24) and in Paper No. 6, filed July 26, 2001, is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (M.P.E.P. § 818.03(a)). Claims 25-50 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The present title is directed only to nucleic acid molecules and the peptide they encode, whereas in contrast the elected claims also include constructs and recombinant host cells.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 and 101

The following is a quotation of the *first* paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The pending claims have been reviewed in light of the Utility Examination Guidelines and Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, "Written Description" Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1092-1111, Friday, January 5, 2001.

Art Unit: 1631

The examiner is using the following definitions in evaluating the claims for utility.

"Specific" - A utility that is *specific* to the subject matter claimed. This contrasts with a *general* utility that would be applicable to the broad class of the invention.

"Substantial" - A utility that defines a "real world" use. Utilities that require or constitute carrying out further research to identify or reasonably confirm a "real world" context of use are not substantial utilities.

"Credible" - Credibility is assessed from the perspective of one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the disclosure and any other evidence of record that is probative of the applicant's assertions. That is, the assertion is an inherently unbelievable undertaking or involves implausible scientific principles.

"Well-established" - a specific, substantial, and credible utility which is well known, immediately apparent, or implied by the specification's disclosure of the properties of a material, alone or taken with the knowledge of one skilled in the art.

35 U.S.C. § 101 reads as follows:

"Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefore, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title".

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention lacks patentable utility due to its not being supported by either specific and/or substantial utility or a well-established utility.

The claimed nucleic acids of claims 1-9 are not supported by a specific asserted utility because the disclosed uses of these compositions are not specific and are generally applicable to any nucleic acid. The specification states that the nucleic acid compounds may be useful as markers, the isolation of polypeptides, hybridization probes, primers, the isolation of full-length cDNAs or genes, which would be used to make protein and optionally further usage for mapping and numerous other generic genetic engineering usages, as well as genetic therapy, such as antisense usage. In fact, the specification summarized modern biotechnology generally but never

Art Unit: 1631

connects any of the specifically elected sequences to any particular or specific utility. This wishlist desire for a utility for the claimed sequences falls short of a readily available utility. Similarly, protein may be used for detection of expression, antibody production, Western blots, etc. These are non-specific uses that are applicable to nucleic acid(s) and/or proteins in general and not particular or specific to the nucleic acids being claimed. Claims 10-24 depend from 1-9 and thus also lack utility.

Further, the claimed nucleic acids are not supported by a substantial utility because no substantial utility has been established for the claimed subject matter. For example, a nucleic acid may be utilized to obtain a protein. The protein could then be used in conducting research to functionally characterize the protein. The need for such research clearly indicates that the protein and/or its function is not disclosed as to a currently available or substantial utility. A starting material that can only be used to produce a final product does not have substantial asserted utility in those instances where the final product is not supported by a specific and substantial utility. In this case none of the proteins that are to be produced as final products resulting from processes involving claimed nucleic acid have asserted or identified specific and substantial utilities. The research contemplated by applicant(s) to characterize potential protein products, especially their biological activities, does not constitute a specific and substantial utility. Identifying and studying the properties of a protein itself or the mechanisms in which the protein is involved does not define a "real world" context or use. Similarly, the other listed and asserted utilities as summarized above or in the instant specification are neither substantial nor specific due to being generic in nature and applicable to a myriad of such compounds. Note, because the claimed invention is not supported by a specific and substantial asserted utility for

the reasons set forth above, credibility has not been assessed. Neither the specification as filed nor any art of record discloses or suggests any property or activity for the nucleic acid and/or protein compound(s) such that another non-asserted utility would be well established for the compounds.

Claims 1-24 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by a specific, substantial, and credible utility, or, alternatively, a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art would not know how to use the claimed invention.

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The specification discloses sequences that correspond in some undefined way to polypeptides encoded by nucleic acids. The sequences identified (by SEQ ID) per se meet the written description and enablement provisions of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. However it is not disclosed how the provided sequences are in relation to the elected gene 0 <1297184>. No where in the provided Sequence Listing is there a full length nucleic acid base sequence. Claims 1-24 are directed to encompass DNA gene sequences, and fragments of sequences of the provided sequences, corresponding sequences from other species, mutated fragment sequences, allelic variants, splice variants, and so forth. None of these additional sequences meet the written description provision of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. The specification provides insufficient

written description to support the genus encompassed by the claim. This is a rejection based on a lack of WRITTEN DESCRIPTION.

Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19 USPQ2d 1111, makes clear that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession *of the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*." (See page 1117.) The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed." (See Vas-Cath at page 1116.)

The skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed polynucleotides, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it. The nucleic acid itself is required for gene 0 <1297184>. See Fiers v. Revel, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (CAFC 1993) and Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd., 18 USPQ2d 1016. In Fiddes v. Baird, 30 USPQ2d 1481, 1483, claims directed to the complete gene 0, <1297184> were found unpatentable due to lack of written description for the broad class. The specification provided only short amino acid sequences.

Finally, University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co., 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1404, 1405 held that:

...To fulfill the written description requirement, a patent specification must describe an invention and do so in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can clearly conclude that "the inventor invented the claimed invention." *Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.* , 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (1997); *In re Gosteli* , 872 F.2d 1008, 1012, 10 USPQ2d 1614, 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (" [T]he description must clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [the inventor] invented what is

Art Unit: 1631

claimed."). Thus, an applicant complies with the written description requirement "by describing the invention, with all its claimed limitations, not that which makes it obvious," and by using "such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, formulas, etc., that set forth the claimed invention." *Lockwood*, 107 F.3d at 1572, 41 USPQ2d at 1966.

An adequate written description of a DNA, such as the cDNA of the recombinant plasmids and microorganisms of the '525 patent, "requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, chemical name, or physical properties," not a mere wish or plan for obtaining the claimed chemical invention. *Fiers v. Revel*, 984 F.2d 1164, 1171, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Accordingly, "an adequate written description of a DNA requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it; what is required is a description of the DNA itself." *Id.* at 1170, 25 USPQ2d at 1606.

The reference to Table 1 is not itself a written description of that DNA gene sequence selected; it conveys no distinguishing information concerning its identity. No sequence information indicating which nucleotides that constitute gene 0 appears in the instant application. Only a reference to the sequence and segments of it are disclosed. The Applicant(s) is requested to provide the relevant sequences in order to allow proper sequences comparison searches. The sequences identified in the disclosure are amino acid sequences and have no description to their correlation to the claimed polynucleotide sequence referenced to, gene 0.

The following is a quotation of the *second* paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-24 are rejected, as discussed below, under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-5 lack clarity as to the definition of gene 0 <1297184>. There is no clear and concise function described within the specification that explicitly states what gene 0 accomplishes. A possible interpretation of the specification is that the species elected, gene 0 can imply "1. AAA-protein family signature" on page 55; for example, the mammalian N-ethylmaleimide-sensitive fusion protein; or the ATPase yeast protein AFG2. Thus the claimed nucleic acids of the gene 0 species (claims 1-5) lack a clear and concise description of the claimed gene 0. Claims 6-24 are rendered vague and indefinite due to their dependency from claims 1-5. Applicant(s) is requested to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of gene 0 that is regarded as the invention.

Claims 1-3 and 5 are vague and indefinite as to what is meant therein by the limitation "the complement". A possible interpretation is that the complement must be of the same length and be the full and exact complement of the recited gene 0 sequence. Another interpretation is that any complement is meant including those with less than 100% complementarity, such as 90%, 50%, or even 10%. Clarification of the metes and bounds of the claim is requested via clearer claim wording. Claims 4 and 6-24 are rendered vague and indefinite due to their dependency from claims 1-3 and 5.

Claim 5 is vague and indefinite as to what is meant by the limitation "a temperature from about 40° and 48°C below". A possible interpretation is that the temperature must be about 40°C and about 48°C simultaneously, which is not possible. Clarification of the metes and bounds of

the claim is requested; whether the temperature is 40°-48°C or is it 40°C and 48°C at specific points time frames, etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 and 103

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 C.F.R. § 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a

later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of potential 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 103(a) as being unpatentable over SEQ ID 1 and SEQ ID 2 of the US 5,922,554 corresponding to the instant elected gene 0.

The sequences disclosed in the US Patent of the Sequence Listing below columns 29 and 30; are disclosed as amino acid sequences of a NSF (N-ethylmaleimide-sensitive fusion protein) and VCP (valosin containing protein) derived from a mammalian cell. Inherent of these sequences is the DNA that encodes them which in turn prepared as cDNAs from isolated mRNAs which suggests and motivates complements thereof as well as host cells which must contain operatively linked regulatory sequences in order for these sequences to have been grown and isolated therefrom. It is noted that the instant claims are not limited as to what % complementarity is meant by the complement limitations in the claims. Due to the lack of clarity concerning gene 0 (112, 2nd paragraph), this reference seems to disclose or suggest an ATPase as listed on page 55 of the specification.

Thus, it would have been obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to prepare the mRNAs, cDNAs, host cells containing them, in vectors with operative regulatory sequences thus resulting in embodiments of the instant invention.

The burden is hereby shifted to the Applicant(s) to distinguish between the claimed ATPase over the reference as support by the cases *In re Best* and *In re Fitzgerald*.

It is noted that *In re Best* (195 USPQ 430) and *In re Fitzgerald* (205 USPQ 594) discuss the support of rejections wherein the prior art discloses subject matter which there is reason to believe inherently includes functions that are newly cited or is identical to a product instantly

Art Unit: 1631

claimed. In such a situation the burden is shifted to the applicants to "prove that subject matter shown to be in the prior art does not possess characteristic relied on" (205 USPQ 594, second column, first full paragraph).

Claim Objections

Claims 1-3 and 5, are objected to for referencing a Table within the claims (M.P.E.P. § 2173.05 (s)).

Specification Objections

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form or browser-executable code. Applicants are required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01. Such code is present in the specification at page 54, lines 28 and 29; and elsewhere.

Appropriate correction is required.

No claim is allowed.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technical Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technical Center 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and

Art Unit: 1631

1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (See 37 CFR § 1.6(d)). The CM1 Fax Center number is either (703) 308-4242, or (703) 308-4028.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Monika B. Sheinberg, whose telephone number is (703) 306-0511. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8 A.M. to 4 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward, Ph.D., can be reached on (703) 308-4028.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to Patent Analyst, Tina Plunkett, whose telephone number is (703) 305-3524, or to the Technical Center receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

August 16, 2001

Monika B. Sheinberg
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1631

MBS

Ardin H. Marschel
ARDIN H. MARSCHEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER